The Application of Learner-Guided Study to Improve Students' Analytical exposition Writing Skills in EFL Classroom

Syaadiah Arifin[1]*, Hamzah Puadi Ilyas[2] (iD)

[1,2] English Graduate Program Universitas Muhammadiyah Prof. Dr. Hamka (Uhamka) Jakarta, Indonesia
*Corresponding author: syaadiah.arifin@uhamka.ac.id

Abstrak

Pembelajaran terbimbing adalah kegiatan pembelajaran inovatif yang direncanakan oleh sekelompok guru yang dianggap lebih baik daripada yang dilakukan oleh guru secara individu. Namun, efektivitasnya dalam mempertahankan belajar siswa masih diragukan karena tidak ada hubungan yang jelas antara keragaman dan kebutuhan belajar siswa. Tujuan dari penelitian ini adalah untuk menganalisis efektivitas pembelajaran terbimbing dalam meningkatkan kompetensi menulis eksposisi analitis siswa. Pesertanya adalah tiga puluh siswa SMA kelas sebelas. Mereka sering mengalami kesulitan dalam menguasai eksposisi analitis karena kurangnya praktik khusus. Analisis data dilakukan dengan menggunakan desain metode campuran. Mereka dikumpulkan dari tes menulis eksposisi analitis dan wawancara. Hasil dari penelitian ini menunjukkan bahwa kelompok Eksperimen yang diajar dengan lesson study terbimbing melampaui Kelompok Kontrol yang diajar dengan lesson study tidak terarah. Pembelajaran terbimbing membantu siswa mencapai tujuan pembelajaran aspek eksposisi analitis. Studi ini merekomendasikan agar prosedur ini digunakan untuk mengajar menulis dalam genre apa pun, karena dapat meningkatkan keterampilan menulis siswa.

Kata kunci: Pembelajaran yang Dipandu Pelajar, Menulis, Teks Eksposisi Analitik.

Abstract

The learner guided study is innovative learning activity planned by a group of teachers considered better than those made by the individual teacher. However, its effectiveness in retaining the students learning is still dubious since there is no apparent connection between students' learning variety and needs. The aim of this study is to analyze the effectiveness of the learner-guided study in improving students' analytical exposition writing competence. The participants were thirty high school students in grade eleventh. They often encountered difficulties in mastering analytical exposition due to the lack of specific practices. The data analysis was carried out using a mixed-method design. They were gathered from the analytical exposition writing tests and interviews. The results from this study demonstrated that the Experimental group taught with a guided lesson study surpassed the Control Group taught by the unguided lesson study. The guided lesson helped students achieve the learning goals of the analytical exposition aspects. This study recommends that this procedure be used to teach writing in any genre, as it could improve the students' writing skills.

Keywords: Learner-Guided Study, Writing, Analytical Exposition Text.

1. INTRODUCTION

The Lesson Study (LS) is a professional growth method motivating teachers to reflect on their teaching practice. The LS is not much different from collaborative teaching; however, in the LS there are some steps involved: *plan, do* and *see* done together with teachers in the relevant field (Purnama, 2017; Saito et al., 2006). To start the LS project, a group of teachers works on a "*research lesson*" to be discussed in the class. The first stage is *the plan;* teachers work collaboratively to consolidate a lesson plan design suitable to the *research lesson.* The next stage is *do*; at this stage, teachers implement the teaching and learning activities discussed earlier in the planning stage. In the *see* stage, the teachers reflect

on the teaching and learning activities used in the classroom for the following teaching improvement. In this stage, they usually discuss what learning activities work or do not effectively for the subsequent teaching development (Khokhotva & Elexpuru, 2020; Nashruddin & Nurrachman, 2016). This professional growth model is a suitable medium for refining instructional practice in the EFL classroom. LS can offer an opportunity for teachers to work collaboratively to reinforce the connection between instructional planning and student learning (Anfara et al., 2009). Therefore, many researchers have been examining the benefits of LS in various fields and levels, such as Mathematics (Lewis, 2016), Chemistry (Coenders & Verhoef, 2019), English grammar (Collet & Greiner, 2020; Lee, 2008), Writing (Djumingin, 2017; Purnama, 2017; Thien et al., 2021) and reading (Larssen, 2015). The Teacher Lesson Study or "*teacher-led*" successfully improves teachers' teaching quality in the teacher LS project (Latifa, 2019; Lee, 2008; Nashruddin & Nurrachman, 2016). However, the various applications of LS in the classrooms have not entirely made a positive contribution to students' learning. There were some variations in the students' achievements. Although a good *plan, do* and *see* were planned, employed, and reflected, these learning activities are still teachers' paradigms. The discrepancy between the designed learning activities, students' learning preferences, and learning experiences are possibly the primary reasons why the teacher Lesson Study fails (Wood & Cajkler, 2016). It demonstrates that the effect of the LS on students' achievement is not always successful. Therefore, Student involvement or *learner-led* lesson study could be a good alternative to creating the best classroom learning environment. Previous research only focused on teacher lesson study effectiveness without involving students in lesson study activities (Collet & Greiner, 2020; Juniardi & Aulia, 2021; Karabuǧa & Ilin, 2019; Lee, 2008). Only a few studies have observed *learner-led* Lesson study (Tamura & Uesugi, 2020). Their study is considered the turning point in implementing *learner-led* lesson study. The current study aims to discover the effectiveness of the students' involvement in the class or *learner-led* lesson study with a guided lesson in writing Analytical Exposition.

As before mentioned, LS is also outlined as a teacher-led instructional development cycle through which teachers work in a group to accomplish a sequence of stages. The teacher-led lesson study is innovative learning activity planned by a group of teachers considered better than those made by the individual teacher. However, its effectiveness in retaining the students learning is still dubious since there is no apparent connection between students' learning variety and needs. Therefore, the definition has shifted innovative concepts from a different perspective of a lesson study through learner-led lesson study (Tamura & Uesugi, 2020). These terminologies arise as a response to the unsatisfactory results of the teacher-led lesson study with more collaborative teacher-driven perspectives rather than collaborative learner-driven views, although those two kinds of lesson studies originated from the same approaches (Grossman et al., 2001; Stoll et al., 2006). Furthermore, in the teacher-led lesson study (LS), students' learning interactions are controlled while understanding teachers' instruction. Learners are not involved in the whole lesson study process, such as: designing the learning objective, choosing appropriate sources, reflecting and talking about their learning problems and improvement. Therefore, teachers need to find a good solution to teach analytical exposition. Because of its intricacies, L2 teachers and learners at the high school level consider it the most demanding skill to teach and learn (Mada et al., 2022; Untoro, 2016). Because of this condition, many scholars have attempted to improve the quality of teaching to foster EFL learners' analytical writing quality by applying innovative methods. First study applied a group investigation (GI) as an experimental group GI model allows a class to work actively and collaboratively in small groups (Untoro, 2016). The study also included auditory and visual learning styles as independent variables and the intervention. The other group is a control group named

conventional learning model (CV), including auditory and visual learning styles. The overall findings displayed that the group investigation model taught students to outperform the conventional group—another study (Usman & Rizki, 2016). There were two groups: the Guided Writing Technique (EG) as an experimental group and a standard way of teaching writing as a control group (CG).

The Guided Writing technique is an integral part of a balanced writing curriculum and offers a supporting step toward independent writing. The teacher could ask some questions as a strategy to improve the students' skills to comprehend the texts. They can develop their ideas by responding to some of their teachers' questions. As a result, they can express their ideas in written language and create their ideas more effectively. This model is supportive of decreasing the difficulties encountered by students. The results showed that the guided writing technique was beneficial to the students as this model provided specific guidance allowing students to focus on spelling, content, grammar, and mechanics. Students were aware that those were important to produce a good piece of writing; therefore, there was a considerable improvement in their writing skills. In this research, the researcher implemented a learner-guided study. The teacher involved the students in the whole activity with guided lesson study. She requested her students to do their lesson study activities, such as designing their learning objectives and the content of their writing activities.

2. METHODS

This current study employed a mixed-method design consisting of a qualitative and quantitative approach. There were two groups: an experimental group (EG) and a control group (CG). The EG was used to evaluate the efficacy of the guided-lesson study on students' analytical expository writing abilities. The teacher-guided the students to plan their learning goals, contents, activities, reflection and development for several meetings. On the other hand, the students from the control group were not given any guidance throughout their LS activities. The teacher explained the activities of a lesson study cycle to the students. The qualitative approach was applied to clarify the development of learners' writing that could result from participating in a guided-lesson study. Moreover, the qualitative approach was also applied to discover students' perceptions of the learner-guided study. The research participants were thirty (30) high school students (fourteen males and sixteen females, aged 15 to 17) majoring in the science class. This school is a private school located in South Jakarta-Indonesia. The students who enrolled in the Academic Year of 2021-2022 were categorized into the experimental group (15 students) and the control group (15 students). Six classes were divided into two courses: mathematics and natural science (MIPA) and social science (IPS) programs. In this study, the researchers chose only one class randomly. The five writing sessions were conducted offline for elementary and secondary students already started studying offline in Jakarta. The quantitative data on the effectiveness of the guided-lesson, pre-test, and post-test study of analytical exposition writing scoring system were applied (Hamp-Lyons, 1992). There are three dimensions/ aspects in this scoring system: Ideas and Arguments, Rhetorical features, and Language Use. Ideas and arguments deal with the writer's position which is clear, and strongly argued, and supported with data and facts; the viewpoints of others are taken into account. Rhetorical features are concerned with coherence, and the writing displays a control of the organization. Language control deals with the use of appropriate structures and well-chosen vocabulary. These three dimensions were applied while students wrote their analytical exposition. Throughout the application of guided lesson study, the researchers also joined the class and observed students' lesson planning, course content, teaching and learning activities, notes, and writing tasks. Discussions were also conducted with teachers and students regarding students' analytical

exposition writing development at every meeting. Concerning the efficiency of guided lesson study on students' analytical writing, one-way ANOVA was implemented to observe the significant difference in students writing scores. The researcher and the team thematically interpreted students writing development in guided LS activities.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Result

The normality and homogeneity tests were calculated using a one-sample Kolmogorov- test. The test is the main prerequisite before estimating the significant differences in students' analytical expository writing scores between the two interventions. The normality test results show that the pre-test and post-test data in the experimental and control groups are distributed normally. This is indicated by the probability value (Asymp. Sig.) The fourth Kolmogorov-Smirnov test of data (i.e., 0.200; 0.200; 0.174 and 0.200) is greater than 0.05. The results of the homogeneity variance test against pre-test data and post-test show that the research data have a homogeneous variance. This is reflected in the probability value (Sig.) in both data (i.e. 0.206 and 0.807) greater than 0.05. Descriptive statistics and independent sample *t*-tests were used to describe the impact of guided-lesson study implementation.

Table 1. Pre-test Result (Control Group and Experimental Group)

Aspect	Group	Mean	$t_{statistic}$	p_{value}
Ideas and argument	Control	3.80	0.775	0.445
	Ekseprimental	3.60		
Rhetorical features	Control	3.67	-0.302	0.765
	Ekseprimental	3.73		
Language features	Control	4.13	0.564	0.577
	Ekseprimental	4.00		
Overall	Control	11.60	0.441	0.66
	Ekseprimental	11.33		

Table 1 shows that the overall scores of the Control Group are slightly higher than the Experimental Group. However, the *t-tests* display no significant difference in the students' scores (Control Group and Experimental Group). This is indicated by the probability value (p-value) of 0.663 is still greater than 0.05. Similarly, when viewing each aspect, there is no significant difference in the students' scores for the ideas, arguments, rhetorical features, and language features aspects.

Table 2. Pretest-Posttest Testing (Control Group)

Aspect	Mean			$t_{statistic}$	p-value
	Pretest	Posttest	Change		
Indeas and arguments	3.80	4.07	0.27	1.468	0.167
Rhetorical features	3.67	3.80	0.13	0.807	0.433
Leanguage fearures	4.13	-0.20	-0.20	-1.382	0.189
Overall	11.60	11.80	0.20	0.587	0.567

Table 2 displays that the average score of Control Group students after participating in regular learning (posttest) is more significant than the pretest because of the increase in student grades in the ideas and arguments and the aspects of the rhetorical feature. However,

the results of the *t-tests* show no significant improvement in the student grade scores of the Control group during the posttest. This is indicated by the probability value (p-value) of 0.567 is still greater than 0.05. In addition, when viewed per aspect, there was no significant improvement in students' scores for ideas and arguments, rhetorical features, or in language features aspects.

Table 3. Pretest-Posttest Testing (Experimental Group)

| Aspect | Mean | | | $t_{statistic}$ | p-value |
	Pretest	Posttest	Change		
Indeas and arguments	3.60	4.53	0.93	5.137	0.000
Rhetorical features	3.73	4.13	0.40	0.055	0.009
Leanguage fearures	4.00	4.73	-0.73	-1.785	0.000
Overall	11.33	13.40	0.07	0.278	0.000

Table 3 illustrates that the average score of the experimental group after taking the treatment (posttest) is more significant than before taking the treatment (pretest). This is due to the increase in students' grades in the aspects of ideas and arguments, rhetorical features, and aspects of language features. Then the results of the *t-test*s show a significant improvement in the score of experimental group students during the posttest. This is indicated by a probability value (p-value) of 0.000, more diminutive than 0.05. Equally, when viewed per aspect, there is a significant increase in students' scores for ideas and arguments aspects, rhetorical features aspects, and language features aspects.

Table 4. The Students' Score (Control Group and Experimental Group)

Aspect	Group	Mean	$t_{statistic}$	p-value
Ideas and argument	Control	4.07	1.900	0.068
	Ekseprimental	4.53		
Rhetorical features	Control	3.67	2.376	0.025
	Ekseprimental	4.13		
Language features	Control	3.93	4.133	0.000
	Ekseprimental	4.73		
Overall	Control	11.60	3.864	0.001
	Ekseprimental	13.40		

Table 4 shows that the overall scores of Control Group students are lower than the Experimental Group because Experimental Group students are superior in all aspects. Then the *t-test* results show a significant difference in the student's scores (Control Group and Experimental Group). This is shown by a probability value (p-value) of 0.001, smaller than 0.05. Likewise, when viewed per aspect, there are significant differences in student grade scores for rhetorical features aspects and language features aspects. However, there are no significant differences in aspects of ideas and arguments. Lesson planning focused on the conception of analytical exposition writing involving thesis and arguments, data to support the argument, the organization, and the use of appropriate structure and vocabulary. The teacher recommended that each group leader wrote down what he/she wanted to learn from the analytical exposition elements of the lesson plan and what the leader had to do to make the team act in that way on the lesson plan. The lesson plan prepared by the leader was based on the teacher's guidance. Students' lesson plan demonstrated their learning objectives, such as identifying characteristics of analytical exposition writing, understanding analytical elements, and writing a good analytical exposition essay from various sources. The problem

came up when they started writing their thesis statement while formulating learning objectives. An example of a thesis statement from one of the LS teams was*:*

Consuming Too Much Fast Food Was Bad.

The thesis statement above seemed good, but it showed students' incapability of formulating an acceptable and clear thesis while applying the lesson. The topic is too complicated for such a simple statement. The teacher asked the students to find the vague phrases in that thesis; some students raised their hands and gave their opinions. One student mentioned "I think the word *bad* ...does not refer to a specific reference. The teacher also told the students to avoid employing unclear or general words such as attractive, bad, good, or interesting when writing a thesis. It made the thesis less focused. Try to use specific language. A student commented on the thesis statement… "*Can we use past tense to write a thesis statement"? Another student answered "It could be in the form of present tenses, past tenses or future".* After discussing the thesis statement together, then the revision was written into:

Consuming too much fast food will give some bad effects on one's health

The teacher commented on the revised thesis that it was more acceptable and more precise now. The above scripts show how the students translated the teacher's questions and instructions to change unacceptable thesis statements into more acceptable one. In this session, the teacher also explained some suitable vocabulary and grammar points that should be used when writing a thesis statement. She also displayed some examples of good analytical exposition essays, and step-by step explained how to organize their essay starting from the introduction, and the argumentation which is the development of introduction, and the last is the conclusion or the reiteration. The writers conclude their writing by expressing the main argument to remind the readers.

Discussion

The results above show a clear difference between the students' scores for writing analytical exposition when they were taught using the guided-lesson study. The students' involvement in guided LS could develop students' learning (Tamura & Uesugi, 2020) (Usman & Rizki, 2016). The guided study prepared specific guidance that allowed students to focus on the thesis statement, arguments, and conventions such as spelling, punctuation, accuracy, and coherence. Furthermore, content, grammar, and vocabulary were also discussed to make learners realize that those are vital to be considered in writing. The study also showed the teacher's successful efforts to help students learn through adequate instructions. The findings indicate that step-by-step activities through guiding questions could encourage students' learning. The findings of this current study were different from the previous LS study (Tamura & Uesugi, 2020). The former finding did not report guided-lesson plans and learning activities during lesson study activities. This study contributes to guided panning that could improve students' understanding of analytical exposition elements. The teacher and team leader worked collaboratively. The teacher monitored all the activities and learning processes. The team leader from each lesson study group observed another LS team to find out how students from different LS teams learned the elements of analytical exposition writing. The aim of visiting other LS teams was to help students learn. For example, when the leader-student from the different groups observed the first LS team, the teacher found an interactive dialogue between the students and the leader. This meaningful and interactive dialogue between students and the leaders depicted that they began to understand how to write analytical exposition text by writing the thesis statement, elaborating the thesis statement in the body paragraphs, and finding sources to support their arguments.

Therefore, the findings reinforce the idea that social interaction or collaborative learning between team leader, teacher, and LS team could enhance students learning (Tamura & Uesugi, 2020; Untoro, 2016). An in-depth interview was conducted several days after the posttest. The teacher invited all the participants in the Experimental Group to know about their perception of the learner-guided study. Each interview was recorded and transcribed. The interview was conducted in Indonesian to avoid misunderstanding among the students who could not answer the questions in English. There were seven items in the interview. Here are some of the items: what is your perception of the guided study implementation? Do you think teaching through learner-guided study is more attractive than previous methods? Is teaching best understood by applying a learner-guided study**?** The majority of student interviewees had positive opinions on implementing a guided study. The learner-guided study strategies such as teachers' efforts to facilitate students' learning through effective instruction, step-by-step activities through guiding questions, and cooperative learning between the leader, the students, and the teacher were considered the most useful strategies for the students. All the strategies effectively reduced students' anxiety when writing. Teachers' positive attitude help students lessen their anxiety (Rezaei & Jafari, 2014).

4. CONCLUSION

The Lesson Study led by a group of teachers has proved to be a good way to improve teachers' professional growth. They work collaboratively with other teachers from the same field and discuss and reflect on the lesson plan. However, the students' achievements still vary; not all students get good scores as learners are not involved in the whole lesson study process. Students ' learning interactions are controlled in the teacher-led lesson study (LS) while they understand teachers' instruction. In this current study, the researchers also provided a guided lesson study. Students were active participants in designing the learning objective, selecting appropriate sources, and reflecting on their learning problems and improvement. Based on the findings, students taught using guided lesson study outperformed students taught using unguided lesson study. Therefore, the learner-guided study could be an alternative way to be applied in the EFL classroom when teaching writing.

5. REFERENCES

Anfara, V. A., Lenski, S. J., & Caskey, M. M. (2009). Using the Lesson Study Approach to Plan for Student Learning. *Middle School Journal*, *40*(3), 50–57. https://doi.org/10.1080/00940771.2009.11495587.

Coenders, F., & Verhoef, N. (2019). Lesson Study: professional development (PD) for beginning and experienced teachers. *Professional Development in Education*, *45*(2), 217–230. https://doi.org/10.1080/19415257.2018.1430050.

Collet, V. S., & Greiner, A. C. (2020). Revisioning Grammar Instruction through Collaborative Lesson Study: A New Apprenticeship of Observation. *Literacy Research and Instruction*, *59*(2), 95–120. https://doi.org/10.1080/19388071.2019.1709927.

Djumingin, S. (2017). The Practice of Lesson Study Model in Teaching Writing Report Text. *Journal of Education and Learning (EduLearn)*, *11*(1), 103–110. https://doi.org/10.11591/edulearn.v11i1.4315.

Grossman, P., Wineburg, S., & Woolworth, S. (2001). Toward a theory of teacher community. *Teachers College Record*, *103*(6), 942–1012.

Hamp-Lyons, L. (1992). *Holistic writing assessmentof LEP Students*. 1–35. https://doi.org/10.13140/2.1.1759.2643.

Juniardi, Y., & Aulia, T. A. (2021). *Lesson Study : Improving Madrasah Teachers ' Ability in Writing a Scientific Paper in Banten*. *01*(01), 31–39.

Karabuğa, F., & Ilin, G. (2019). Practicing lesson study in a Turkish education context: Considering the challenges, suggestions and benefits from EFL teachers' perspectives. *International Journal for Lesson and Learning Studies*, *8*(1), 60–78. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJLLS-05-2018-0036.

Khokhotva, O., & Elexpuru, A. (2020). Student voice in Lesson Study as a space for EFL teachers' learning: a case study in Kazakhstan. *International Journal for Lesson and Learning Studies*, *9*(2), 153–166. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJLLS-06-2019-0054.

Larssen, D. (2015). The influence of a Lesson Study cycle on a 2nd grade EFL picture book-based teaching practice lesson in Norway Deborah. *NJMLM*, *3*(2), 92–105. https://doi.org/10.46364/njmlm.v3i2.143.

Latifa, I. S. (2019). EFL Lecturers' Perception on the Use of Lesson Study in Improving Pedagogical Content Knowledge. *KnE Social Sciences*, *2019*, 305–316. https://doi.org/10.18502/kss.v3i19.4866.

Lee, J. F. K. (2008). A Hong Kong case of lesson study-Benefits and concerns. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *24*(5), 1115–1124. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2007.10.007.

Lewis, C. (2016). How does lesson study improve mathematics instruction? *ZDM - Mathematics Education*, *48*(4), 571–580. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11858-016-0792-x.

Mada, R. D., Fachriyah, E., & Hasanah, A. (2022). Hortatory and Analytical Exposition Analysis on Student'S Writing. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Literature (JELTL)*, *5*(1), 77–83. https://doi.org/10.47080/jeltl.v5i1.1779.

Nashruddin, W., & Nurrachman, D. (2016). The Implementation of Lesson Study in English Language Learning: A Case Study. *Dinamika Ilmu*, *16*(2), 169. https://doi.org/10.21093/di.v16i2.356

Purnama, S. (2017). Improving The Students' Writing Co.mpetence in a Second Language Acquisition through The Implementation of Lesson Study. *JETL (Journal Of Education, Teaching and Learning)*, *2*(1), 77. https://doi.org/10.26737/jetl.v2i1.140.

Rezaei, M., & Jafari, M. (2014). Investigating the Levels, Types, and Causes of Writing Anxiety among Iranian EFL Students: A Mixed Method Design. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *98*, 1545–1554. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.03.577.

Saito, E., Harun, I., Kuboki, I., & Tachibana, H. (2006). Indonesian lesson study in practice: Case study of indonesian mathematics and science teacher education project. *Journal of In-Service Education*, *32*(2), 171–184. https://doi.org/10.1080/13674580600650872.

Stoll, L., Bolam, R., McMahon, A., Wallace, M., & Thomas, S. (2006). Professional learning communities: A review of the literature. *Journal of Educational Change*, *7*(4), 221–258. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10833-006-0001-8.

Tamura, T., & Uesugi, Y. (2020). Involving students in lesson study: a new perspective. *International Journal for Lesson and Learning Studies*, *9*(2), 139–151. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJLLS-04-2018-0026.

Thien, N. M., Vo, P., & Nhu, Q. (2021). Reading Lessons For EFL Students. *International Journal of Progressive Sciences and Technologies (IJPSAT)*, *26*(2), 89–96. https://doi.org/10.52155/ijpsat.v26.2.3079.

Untoro, B. (2016). The Effect of Group Investigation and Learning Style on Students' Writing of Analytical Exposition. *IJEE (Indonesian Journal of English Education)*, *3*(1), 29–45. https://doi.org/10.15408/ijee.v3i1.3445.

Usman, B., & Rizki, Z. (2016). Using the Guided Writing Technique to Teach Writing of Analytical Exposition Texts. *English Education Journal*, *1*(7), 29–45. http://www.jurnal.unsyiah.ac.id/EEJ/article/view/3159.

Wood, P., & Cajkler, W. (2016). A participatory approach to Lesson Study in higher education. *International Journal for Lesson and Learning Studies*, *5*(1), 4–18. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJLLS-08-2015-0027.